

1 MELINDA HAAG (CASBN 132612)
United States Attorney

2 MIRANDA KANE (CABN 150630)
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 AUTUMN R. PORTER (CASBN 240750)
5 Special Assistant United States Attorney

6 Defense Language Institute – Criminal Law
1336 Plummer Street, Building 275
7 Monterey, CA 93944
Telephone: (831) 242-6394
8 Email: autumn.r.porter.mil@mail.mil

9 Attorneys for Plaintiff

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12 SALINAS DIVISION

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

14 Plaintiff,

15 vs.

16 MARIA D. ORTEGA ~~SANCHEZ~~,
Sanchez

17 Defendant.
18

Criminal No.: CR-12-00166 HRL

19)
20) SECOND STIPULATION AND
21) ~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

19 On August 6, 2012, the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status hearing.
20 The parties jointly requested that the case be continued from August 6, 2012, until October 1,
21 2012 at 9:30 a.m., in order to allow counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation.
22 In addition, the parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act, from August
23 6, 2012 to October 1, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. The parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time
24 is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of counsel.
25
26

SECOND STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
CASE NO: CR-12-00166 HRL

FILED

AUG 1 8 2012

RICHARD W. WIEKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE

1 SO STIPULATED:

MELINDA HAAG
United States Attorney

2
3 DATED: August 10, 2012

/S/
AUTUMN R. PORTER
Special Assistant United States Attorney

4
5
6 DATED:

/S/
MANUEL ARAUJO
Counsel for the Defendant

7
8
9
10 ORDER

11 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
12 under the Speedy Trial Act from August 6, 2012 to October 1, 2012. The Court finds, based on
13 the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice are served by granting the requested
14 continuance and outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The
15 failure to grant the requested continuance would deny the parties reasonable time necessary for
16 effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a
17 miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made
18 under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

19 SO ORDERED.

20 DATED: 8/13/12


HOWARD R. LLOYD
United States Magistrate Judge